

REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 1, 9, and 20-22 are hereby amended. Claims 2-8, 10-11, 13-14, and 19 were previously cancelled. Claims 25-36 are hereby added. Claims 25-36 are the pending claims from co-pending U.S. patent application 10/786,743 and are hereby amended. The pending application includes claims 1, 9, 12, 15-18, and 20-36.

Applicant thanks the Examiner and his SPE for taking the time to conduct a personal interview with the Applicant's representatives on September 16, 2008, with respect to this application and co-pending U.S. patent application 10/786,743. A summary of the substance of the interview is reflected in the Examiner's interview summary of U.S. patent application 10/786,743, as well as in the following remarks.

As an initial matter, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office asserts that claim 1 does not specify that the claimed invention includes hardware.

In view of the Office's 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite "a processor." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claim 1.

In addition, reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested in view of the following:

The Claims are Allowable over the Prior Art Because the Prior Art Fails to Disclose a Help System that Processes Documentation Content of an Integrated Development Extension upon Import of the Integrated Development Environment Extension into the Integrated Development Environment

Claims 1, 9, 12, 15-18, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028364, "Chan") in view of Sullivan et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0016238, "Sullivan") and Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,024,658, "Cohen"). Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan, Sullivan, Cohen, as applied to claim in, in further view of Chong et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0184610).

Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested because the prior art fails to disclose a help system that processes documentation content of an integrated development environment extension upon import of an integrated development environment extension into the integrated development environment.

One embodiment is a system that extends an online help system and display when an integrated development environment extension is imported into an integrated development environment. See, e.g., page 6 of the Applicant's specification. This feature is beneficial in that it obviates a number of problems, associated with extending a development environment and its associated help systems, such as requiring a developer to take a number of manual steps, often in a different environment, or using a different set of tools in the same environment. See, e.g., pages 1-2 of the Applicant's specification. In addition,

Applicant's embodiment provides a system in which the integration of the help content of the integrated development environment extension is automatic from the user's and the extension/control developer's points of view. See, e.g., page 5 of the Applicant's specification.

In contrast to embodiments of the present invention, and as discussed in the September 16, 2008 interview, none of the cited prior art is directed to integrating documentation content of an integrated development environment extension into a help system when an extension is being imported into an integrated development environment. Specifically, in contrast to the cited prior art, independent claim 1 recites "a help system that processes documentation content upon import of an integrated development environment extension into the integrated development environment."

Chan does not disclose these features, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Chan discloses providing development assistance for a program comprising code in more than one language. See Chan at Abstract. In particular, the Office cites paragraph 5 of page 1 of Chan as being relevant to Applicant's claim 1.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. In paragraph 5, Chan discloses providing context sensitive help, i.e., help that relates to code at the location of a cursor. Chan, however, does not disclose the features of claim 1, such as a help system that processes documentation content upon import of an integrated development environment extension into the integrated development environment. Nowhere does Chan disclose integrating documentation content into a help system upon importing an integrated development environment extension into an integrated

development environment. As such, Chan does not anticipate or render obvious the features, as recited in claim 1.

Sullivan does not remedy the deficiencies of Chan. Rather, Sullivan discloses a help system that includes a help engine that receives the current context from each active component, dynamically builds a current overall context of the application based on each received current context, locates help topics based on the current overall context, and filters and prioritizes the located help topics. See Sullivan at Abstract. Sullivan does not disclose extending his help system, or an integrated development environment. Consequently, Sullivan cannot possibly disclose or suggest the features of claim 1, such as “a help system that processes documentation content of an integrated development environment extension upon import of the integrated development environment extension into the integrated development environment,” as recited.

Cohen fails to cure the deficiencies of Chan and Sullivan. Rather, Cohen discloses an extensible help facility for a computer software application. As illustrated in Fig. 7, Cohen discloses extending a help facility of a computer software application by generating a help file or retrieving a help file. Cohen, however, does not disclose an integrated development environment or an integrated development environment extension. As such, Cohen cannot possibly disclose or suggest a help system that processes documentation content upon import of an integrated development environment extension into an integrated development environment, as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that the other cited reference (i.e., Chong), do not remedy the failure of Chan, Sullivan, and Cohen to disclose or suggest at least the aforementioned subject matter of independent claim 1.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 and independent claim 25, which recites similar limitations, are allowable over the cited prior art. The remaining claims depend from either claim 1 or claim 25, and are also be allowable for at least the above reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request favorable action in connection with this application.

The Examiner is invited and urged to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

No fee is believed to be due for this submission. Should a fee be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any such fee to Womble Carlyle's Deposit Account No. 09-5028.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: October 2, 2008


Kathy Takeguchi (Reg. No. 55,988)
Womble, Carlyle, Sandridge & Rice
P.O. Box 7037
Atlanta, GA 30357-0037
703-394-2270